

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-22 are pending in this Application.

Claims 1-3, 5, 8, 9, 16, and 17 are currently amended. Applicants respectfully submit that support for the claim amendments can be found throughout the specification and the drawings.

Claims 1-22 remain pending in the Application after entry of this Amendment.

No new matter has been entered.

In the Office Action, claims 1-3, 5, 8, 9-11, 13, 16-18, and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,796,489 (hereinafter “Slater”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,807,633 (hereinafter “Pavlik”). Claims 4, 12, and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Slater, in view of Pavlik, and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,434,917 (hereinafter “Naccache”). Claims 6, 7, 14, 15, 21, and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Slater, in view of Pavlik, and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,584,459 (hereinafter “Chang”).

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections to claims 1-22 and request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Slater, Pavlik, Naccache, and Chang. Applicants respectfully submit that Slater, Pavlik, Naccache, and Chang, either individually or in combination, fail to disclose one or more of the claim limitations recited in each of claims 1-22. These differences, along with other difference, establish that the subject matter as a whole of claims 1-22 would not have been obvious at the time of invention to a person of ordinary skill in the art.

For example, amended claim 1 recites the feature of “in response to detecting the occurrence of the application event at the computer system when the one of the database applications instantiates the database transaction associated with the application event with the database management system of a database, automatically generating the electronic record with the computer system from data intercepted from the database transaction according to the mapping between the data from the underlying database tables associated with the database transaction to the at least some of the fields in the electronic record.” As recited in amended

claim 1, first information is provided by a user via “a graphical user interface configured to enable users of the computer system to define operations by one or more database applications as triggering conditions for application events monitored by the computer system and processing that occurs when the application events are triggered, the first information defining an application event that, upon occurrence.” (Application: FIG. 5 and related description). As recited in amended claim 1, first information received via the graphical user interface defines “an application event that, upon occurrence, causes the computer system to intercept a database transaction instantiated by one of the database applications with a database management system of a database and generate from data identified in the database transaction an electronic record that requires an electronic signature.” (Application: Paragraphs [0052]-[0053]). Accordingly, the defined application event recited in amended claim 1 is triggered by “a database transaction instantiated by one of the database applications with a database management system of a database” and is associated with processing that “generate[s] from data identified in the database transaction an electronic record that requires an electronic signature.”

Applicants respectfully submit that Slater, Pavlik, Naccache, and Chang, either individually or in combination, fail to disclose the mechanism for defining application events and the process of generating electronic records as recited in amended claim 1. Slater fails to disclose the mechanism for defining application events recited in amended claim 1 because Slater merely discloses providing information used in preparing a land transaction that the Office Action alleges “not only defines a land transaction, but also defines the parties involved in the land transaction.” This information in Slater does not define “operations by one or more database applications as triggering conditions for application events monitored by the computer system and processing that occurs when the application events are triggered” as recited in amended claim 1. Applicants also understand the Office Action to conclude that the “signing ceremony” or the coming together of the participants in Slater is allegedly an “event.” Yet, Slater, Pavlik, Naccache, and Chang, do not disclose that users of a computer system define “application events” via a graphical user interface as recited in amended claim 1.

Thus, the use of the analogy of preparing documents for a land transaction from Slater by the Office Action in rejecting claim 1 is deficient. Slater fails to disclose that users of a

computer system define via a graphical user interface operations in one or more database applications as recited as triggering conditions for application events monitored by the computer system and processing that occurs when the application events are triggered as recited in amended claim 1 when preparing the documents for the land transaction in Slater. The Office Action also fails to resolve the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art because the Office Action considers the “application event” recited in claim 1 to be equivalent to the “signing ceremony” of Slater. In light of the claims alone, the recited application event define by a user whereupon occurrence a database transaction is intercepted is substantially different from the coming together of the participants in Slater.

Moreover, Slater fails to disclose the mechanism for generating electronic records as recited in amended claim 1. The Office Action simply views the retrieval of a template from memory as equivalent to intercepting data from a database transaction. Yet, Slater, Pavlik, Naccache, and Chang, fail to disclose in response to detecting the occurrence of the application event at the computer system when the one of the database applications instantiates the database transaction associated with the application event with the database management system of a database, automatically generating the electronic record with the computer system from data intercepted from the database transaction according to the mapping between the data from the underlying database tables associated with the database transaction to the at least some of the fields in the electronic record. Retrieval of a template from memory cannot be interpreted as the claimed feature recited in amended claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Slater, Pavlik, Naccache, and Chang, either individually or in combination, fail to disclose each and every claim limitation recited in amended claim 1.

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 9 and 17 are allowable for at least a similar rationale as discussed above for the allowability of claim 1, and others. Applicants respectfully submit that dependent claims 2-8, 10-16, and 18-22 that depend directly and/or indirectly from the independent claims 1, 9, and 17 respectively, are also allowable for at least a similar rationale as discussed above for the allowability of the independent claims.

Applicants further respectfully submit that the dependent claims recite additional features that make the dependent claims allowable for additional reasons.

Unless otherwise specified, amendments to the claims are made for the purposes of clarity, and are not intended to alter the scope of the claims or limit any equivalents thereof.

While Applicants do not necessarily agree with the prior art rejections set forth in the Office Action, these amendments may be made to expedite issuance of the Application. Applicants reserve the right to pursue claims to subject matter similar to those pending before the present Amendment in co-pending or subsequent applications.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance and an action to that end is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 925-472-5000.

Respectfully submitted,

/Sean F. Parmenter, Reg. No. 53,437/
Sean F. Parmenter
Reg. No. 53,437

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 925-472-5000
Fax: 415-576-0300
SFP:lls
61763650 v1